

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed August 7, 2003, has been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a preliminary matter, the Office Action was discussed during a personal interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor on December 2, 2003, for which, the undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for taking his time to discuss the Office Action.

As a result of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Yamana. Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Yamana and further in view of Amano. And claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Yamana and further in view of Fujimura. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

By the above amendment, claim 1 has been amended and it now requires the first lens and the second lens being formed as an integral one-piece lens and secured to the substrate. Support for this amendment is clearly found in Figures 2, 4, and 6. Underlying the present invention is Applicant's recognition that since the first and the second lenses are formed as an integral one-piece

lens, the manufacturing and assembling of the integral lens is simplified, and the exchanging of the parts in the combined lens groups can be easily performed. Neither Yamana nor Rosenberg, taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests the first and the second lenses being formed as an integral one-piece lens and secured to the substrate. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is now patentable over the prior art combination.

Claims 5 and 6 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1, and since Amano does not address the shortcomings of the Rosenberg and Yamana combination, namely, the first and the second lenses being formed as an integral one-piece lens and secured to the substrate, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is patentable over prior art for the same reasons provided in connection with claim 1.

Claim 3 is dependent from claim 1 and is patentable over prior art for the same reasons provided in connection with claim 1.

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated August 7, 2003, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1-3 and 5-6 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,  
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia  
Reg. No. 50,215